

***Village of Barrington
Plan Commission
Minutes***

Date: June 10, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chair
Curt Larsen, Vice Chair
Bhagwant Sidhu
Harry Burroughs
Steve Mack
Steve Morrissey

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Senior Planner
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

Call to Order

Ms. Bush called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chairperson, present; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, absent; Steve Morrissey, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Ms. Bush announced minutes will be deferred to the end.

Ms. Bush announced the order of the petitions and the procedure.

Old Business

PC 02-07 Amendment to the Village of Barrington Comprehensive Plan Chapter 8, Chapter 10, Chapter 11 Appendix A, and Appendix B.

Petitioners: Village of Barrington, Keith Sbiral, Senior Planner

Mr. Larsen recused himself.

Mr. Morrissey recused himself.

Mr. Sbiral explained that the amendment was Village initiated and concerned the former Jewel Tea property at 511 Lake Zurich Road. Mr. Sbiral explained that the petition had been lengthy due to the connection with the Garlands project.

Ms. Bush asked if the Plan Commission should consider the connection to the Garlands.

Mr. Sbiral said that staff recommended deferring the portions that were connected with the Garlands until the traffic engineers and IDOT have determined the best options for the Global Traffic Plan.

Mr. Sbiral explained that the change on page 36 of the Comprehensive Plan would strike the language from the Comprehensive Plan regarding the adaptive reuse of the property in conjunction with the referendum that was

passed in March 2002.

Mr. Sbiral explained that the change on page 43 would allow recreational uses on the front 15 acres and would change the property to open space from a mixed land use.

Mr. Sbiral discussed the change in density that would occur by changing the property from mixed use to open space. These reductions in density numbers would be affected in Appendix A and Appendix B.

Mr. Sbiral said that staff recommends approval of the amendment.

Mr. Mack asked what the motion would be relative to the Garlands portion.

Mr. Sbiral explained that the motion would include deferring these aspects of the petition to a later date.

Ms Bush swore is anyone wishing to speak.

Ms. Terry Jennings, Director of the Barrington Park District.

Ms. Jennings said that the Park District supports the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Doug Skor, 248 West Lincoln Avenue, Citizens for the Barrington Community Center.

Mr. Skorr explained that the this group was distinct from the Barrington Historical Society. Mr. Skor explained the group's plans for designing a community center for the various not-for-profit organizations in the Village of Barrington. Mr. Skor said that the group was looking to reuse the former Jewel Tea Building. Mr. Skorr explained that the group was still working to finalize plan. He said that the Plan Commission should consider this plan in lieu of demolition.

Karl Heightman, 701 South Cook Street.

Mr. Heightman said that he was an eighteen year resident of Barrington. He is an architect. Mr. Heightman and his wife voted for the March 2002 referendum. He gave a computer-generated presentation. Mr. Heightman read the Village's Vision Statement and discussed what made Barrington a great place to live. Mr. Heightman said that Barrington is a village divided. He gave an overview of the Village's history. Mr. Heightman went over an alternate plan for the former Jewel Tea property that preserved the original building. Mr. Heightman said that the building should be preserved because it was a symbol of Barrington.

Ms. Bush asked where the funds would come from and who owned the building.

Mr. Heightman said he would be in meetings to put packages together, but time is needed. He stated that the wrecking ball needed to stopped.

Ms. Bush said that answers were needed and that this body had a formal proposal from the Park District and

Mr. Mack asked how long before the questioned were answered.

Mr. Heightman said two weeks.

Ms. Bush asked about funding.

Mr. Heightman said he was not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. Burroughs asked if the Park District had worked with the group.

Mr. Heightman said that they had not been able to get in contact with the Park District.

Ms. Bush asked for a response from Ms. Jennings.

Ms. Jennings said that this was the first time that the Park District had seen the plan, but had asked the group to not show the community the plan before the PD got to see it. Ms. Jennings noted the Public Referendum and stated that she felt the Park District was being denied due process, she noted that the vote was for the park, explained the process for acquiring the land, public participation, Park District was not a landlord and could not consider these other alternatives.

Ms. Bush asked if the Park District was fee-simple owner.

Ms. Jennings said that they were and had been directed by the referendum to purchase the land.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Don Kline, 82 East Timberlake Drive.

Mr. Kline stated he was not here to fight the park district. Mr. Kline said that he was here to speak for preserving the building. The project would be a difficult one. Mr. Kline said that the community should at least look at the options and postpone demolition. He said that the two groups should sit down together. Most projects in this area are hard, but that should not discourage the community from pursuing preservation of the building. Mr. Kline felt that this project has regional implications.

Peg Cullen, 987 Bosworth Field Road.

Ms. Cullen had become very involved with the Jewel Tea Building in 1997. Ms. Cullen was part of the community forum to become more proactive in the development of the property in question. Ms. Cullen referred to the survey that was used to determine the use for the property. Open space won, but a mixed use building was a close second. Ms. Cullen discussed the cost to rehab the Jewel Tea Building (July 1999 dollars). A detailed study determined that the cost of rehabbing the building would have been \$15 million. The building had deteriorated since then. Ms. Cullen said that the building is trashed due to vandalism and neglect. The money was not there to preserve and rehab the building. She noted that the building was too large to reuse. Ms. Cullen argued that the Village couldn't even get the money to rehab the Catlow. She said that she was disturbed that these efforts are last minute and she wondered where were these people 2 years ago? Ms. Cullen quoted the 2002 referendum and noted that it was quite clear what people were voting for.

Loxie Hippsie, 282 W Cuba Road.

Ms. Hippsie quoted numbers for demolishing the building (about \$2 million). She asked why not stretch this money out over time.

Rob Arnold, 674 Stillwater Lane.

Mr. Arnold said that the residents voted for park space and open space, not parking for 500+ cars.

Ms. McManus,

Ms. McManus stated that she moved to Barrington to raise children and had noticed that it lacked park space. She said that she was enthusiastic that the building would be coming down in favor of the park space. An open park was more desirable than a park with a large building.

John Bresland, Bresland Lane.

Mr. Bresland stated that he came out to Barrington 1 or 2 times as a kid and was struck by the wooded nature of the Jewel Tea property. There was no controversy except for the handful of people trying to preserve the building. The building prevented views to Cuba Marsh and diminished the value of the project. The building had did not provide any of the charm for the property. The building should come down. The community was willing to pay for the removal of the building and the creation of the building. Recommended implementing the Comp Plan amendment.

Jim Lundmark, Stratford Company.

Mr. Lundmark said that there were practical considerations for the alternate plan. He noted that there were serious fundamental design plans. Mr. Lundmark pointed out that fire access problems, grading issues, mixing 200,000 sq ft of office space with park was a dangerous mix of uses. Mr. Lundmark also stated that economics

were an issue. He compared the estimated that it would take \$20 million to rehab the building which is comparable to the Cook St. Plaza project.

Ms. Bush closed public comment.

Mr. Sbiral said that the task at hand was to align the comp plan with the referendum vote.

Mr. Burroughs questioned the language about repealing the adaptive reuse. He noted that more time should be granted due to the controversy.

Ms. Sidhu said that she had worked hard to come up with plans for preserving historic building through the comprehensive Plan process and was not ready to let this language be approved. Ms. Sidhu did vote for the referendum, but was concerned that the language was not clear and did not believe the building would be demolished.

Ms. Bush said she was a historic preservationist, but was also practical. Ms. Bush wished to set a time frame on allowing the alternate plan to formulate. She noted that if a real plan was in place, then the alternate plan should get some consideration.

Ms. Sidhu asked about the time frame.

Ms. Bush said that the date should be fair to all parties.

Mr. Sbiral clarified that the language would be left in place until a certain date.

MOTION: Mr. Burroughs made motion to keep the language as is until September 1, 2003 and, if a complete adaptive reuse plan was not in place the new language would be approved. Ms. Sidhu seconded. Ms. Bush, yes, Burroughs, yes, Sidhu, yes, Mack, yes, Larsen, recused, Morrissey, recused, Rometty, absent.

Mr. Larsen and Mr. Morrissey returned to the dias.

New Business

PC 03-04 Barrington Memorial Park (Northeast Corner of Hough Street and Lincoln Avenue) – Public Hearing.

Petitioners: Village of Barrington, Beth Raseman, Trustee

Mr. Sbiral gave the staff review and overview of the project. Mr. Sbiral indicated that this is a village initiated petition. Mr. Sbiral also indicated that staff recommends the PC adopt the findings of staff.

Ms. Raseman went over the process of purchasing and planning of the property. Ms. Raseman indicated that the Village came to a determination of a memorial park based on the loss of a police officer in the line of duty and events of September 11, 2001.

MOTION: Mr. Larsen moved to recommend approval of PC 03-04 adopting staff's findings as the Plan Commission's. Mr. Burroughs seconded. Ms. Bush, yes; Mr. Burroughs, yes; Ms. Sidhu, yes; Mr. Mack, yes; Mr. Larsen, yes; Mr. Morrissey, recused; Mr. Rometty, absent.

PC 03-06 BACOG Impact Fee Proposal (Presentation by BACOG).

Petitioners: Janet Agnoletti, Executive Director of BACOG.

Mr. Sbiral gave background on the case. He stated that the Village had an annexation voluntary donation policy that was amended to be in line with the BACOG model ordinance. The BOT had initiated an amendment to the subdivision ordinance relative to impact fees.

Ms. Agnoletti presented information about impact fees and what they were used for. She discussed the area's interest in impact fees. Ms. Agnoletti noted that a local attorney from Barrington researched the case law and background of impact fees.

Ms. Agnoletti noted that substantial discussions were undertaken to discuss the process of impact fees and the substantial questions surrounding them. The BACOG Board approved a report in October of 2001. A committee was formed with representatives from each BACOG village as well as most of the taxing bodies represented.

Ms. Agnoletti stated that BACOG hired an attorney to do the final research and that outside funding was sought and a contract administered through BACOG was developed. She discussed that the ordinance was designed specifically for this area.

The goals of the program were as follows:

1. The program must be regional and be uniform among villages.
2. The program must be comprehensive and include the most directly affected districts.
3. The program be able to cover costs.
4. The program must be legally defensible

The ordinance is based on the Naperville model – legally defensible model in the State of Illinois. The fee is based on land values and population projections and provides fees to the school district, the park district, the fire district and the library district

The ordinance has a dispute resolution process that slows down the litigation process. The fee can be paid at the time of building permit rather than at time of platting.

Mr. Larsen asked what the flexibility means.

Ms. Agnoletti said that there is no enabling legislation in the state of Illinois.

Mr. Morrissey asked about the voluntary portion of the fee.

Ms. Agnoletti said that the timing is what is voluntary, not the fee itself.

Ms. Agnoletti noted that the districts are assuming the liability of the impact fee ordinance on behalf of the villages. BACOG will be lobbying the state of Illinois for impact fee legislation.

Ms. Agnoletti said the N. Bar, Deer Park, and Lake Barrington BOTs have passed the ordinance and that the S. Barrington and Barrington Hills Plan Commissions have passed the ordinance. Ms. Agnoletti discussed the modifications that have been made by communities to the ordinance.

Mr. Larsen asked about the various community surveys. Mr. Larsen asked if this ordinance was in conformance with most of the other communities.

Ms. Agnoletti clarified what the Naperville model was and the land values in the communities was the reason that the survey numbers did not match.

Ms. Agnoletti discussed that the impact fee model depends on the demand for developable land.

Mr. Larsen asked about providing impact fees for tear downs and expansions.

Ms. Agnoletti said that state laws said impact fees were really only valid in new subdivision cases. Some communities do charge fees for the new portions of homes when they are torn down/expanded, however, the authority was not really there to do this since there was no new subdivision of land. The risk of litigation was relatively small.

Ms. Bush asked what the next step was.

Mr. Sbiral discussed what lots would be covered under this ordinance. There were very few lots that would fall under this ordinance. The empty, currently subdivided lots could be charged an impact fee and this was what staff would be looking at and making a recommendation to the PC.

Mr. Burroughs asked about how the ordinance addresses teardowns.

Mr. Sbiral said that the ordinance would only touch on currently unbuilt lots.

Mr. Burroughs asked about the fee schedule relative to the Village's ability to change fee schedule.

Ms. Agnoletti noted that the fees would be calculated based on the facilities needed and land values. Land values would be the only factor that could be varied from village to village.

Ms. Agnoletti noted that the ordinance was mildly aggressive.

Ms. Bush asked about the possibilities of applying the ordinance to the teardowns.

Ms. Agnoletti said that this was possibilities.

Ms. Bush directed staff to look at the teardown issue specifically.

Mr. Sbiral said that staff would. Mr. Sbiral also said most public improvements such as water connections and roads were covered in the regular permit fees.

Mr. Morrissey asked about the effective date of the ordinance relative to land that would be subdivided but un-built at the time of passage of any impact fee ordinance.

Mr. Sbiral said that most of the fees that the Village charges are charged at the time of permit.

Mr. Morrissey asked if Naperville was part of any council of governments.

Mr. Sbiral said impact fees would be on for the first meeting in July.

Planner's Report

Mr. Sbiral noted that the Park District was the only petition for June 23.

Ms. Bush asked for the commissioners to look at their schedules for a vacation time.

Adjournment

Mr. Larsen moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Mack seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all Ayes. The motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

Anna Bush, Chairperson
Plan Commission